
Subject: Gun control

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 13:03:11 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I've seen this pop up in a few other topics so I decided to start it on my own.

What do you think about gun control laws? (This is mostly relating to those of us living in the United States)

Personally I believe that no matter what laws or restrictions you put against firearms criminals will still get them if they want them badly enough.

I do believe that the public doesn't necessarily need certain weapons like assault rifles and snipers, simple defense hand guns among other weapons of similar nature should be the only ones that are allowed (unless you have trained use and a license with said weapon.)

I believe the second amendment was mainly put in place because of the time the Constitution was created in. It was necessary for you to have some sort of weapon handy in case another problem like the Revolutionary war broke out, but that isn't really an issue anymore, and we don't need civilians running around with heavy assault weapons. This is why I believe that civilians should be able to obtain simple defensive weapons like semi-automatic pistols or revolvers with the normal background check that they use now, but for more advanced weapons, they are required to be trained for a given amount of time to handle other such weapons, I also believe some weapons should require military training.

How do you guys feel about it?

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 13:19:12 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Some of the guns that you can own in the USA is well, not needed really and it's just a gun head thing, you also need to tighten up the guns laws since they suck bollocks.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 13:24:10 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If I want a sniper rifle or a machine gun, I should damn well have the right to own one. The VAST majority of people with these guns would have no intention to use it against other people, even in times of self-defense because those weapons would just be too cumbersome. Plus, just because you restrict a certain type of gun to citizens doesn't mean you're preventing criminals from getting them. Also, why don't we hear more about incidents like the DC Sniper? Sure, he bought the gun legally, but this is a rare occurrence. Why? Because the VAST majority of people aren't looking to go killing people randomly. Those that do, they'll get the gun any way they can. Even if the

"sniper" had to get it from the black market, the worst it would have done was delay the shootings, not prevent them.

The Second Amendment wasn't FOR the times it was written, but BECAUSE of the time that it was written. The colonies saw just how dangerous a tyrannical government was, and they knew damn well that it would happen again. If the people weren't guaranteed the right to own guns, there would be no way of defending themselves against an army WITH guns. Tell me, how well do sticks and knives do against guns and cannons (now would be artillery)?

Even if guns didn't help with the self-defense of innocent civilians (and boy do they), we need them to fend off a tyrannical government. You know, much like the one that the US government is currently becoming. There may just come a time that we have to fight and die for our rights again, and we can't do that without guns. Don't tell me it can't happen, either. Our founding fathers made some grim prophesies about what would happen with the eroding of our civil liberties. They've been dead on the money. I won't be doubting their wisdom. Human nature doesn't change.

Anybody willing to deny that guns used for self-defense assist people isn't someone I want to even debate. The fact that most people with guns are responsible. Even then, accidents WILL happen. If you want to talk about accidental gun shootings, then we need to talk about the accidental car deaths. We should talk about drownings. We should talk about people dying while playing sports. The fact is, accidents happen all of the time, and people die as a result. It's incredibly tragic, but let's not get carried away and suggest that we all live in a fucking bubble to protect us from dangers.

Edit: I won't deny that people buy guns in excess, and a lot of the guns aren't needed. That's a given. People like to own a lot of things. It's just human nature. However, the same can be said just about everything. I have 2 computers, a laptop and a desktop. I don't need both. I have several First Person Shooter games. I have 200 CDs. I have a phone that can play MP3s AND an MP3 player I have several hard drives that aren't even half-full. The thing is, I wouldn't even call myself very materialistic, either. I bet some of you have way more things in excess. Should we take all of this away? Are you willing to? Hmm?

Edit 2: Apparently that Bushmaster XM-15 (AR-15) used in the DC Sniper attacks was stolen, too.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [Caveman](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 13:49:24 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Guns were made to kill people...Therefore they should be illegal to have and yes before anyone says so were XYZ should those be banned to.. Simple answer, yes.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 13:59:39 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I want my bubble, too!

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [Ryu](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 14:27:53 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I mean, In Britain, it's great, I never worry someone is going to shoot me, and if someone did, when I'm being rushed to hospital at least I don't think to myself "Shit, will I be able to pay for this operation?"

But then we have to worry about knives.. which is a problem in London for the most part, proof:

That's how bad stabbing in London are, they need to add them around the city, lol.

I like gun control - and when the Government turns their back on us, 2000 citizens rushing a unsuspecting Military barracks is a guarantee for free weapons.

hurr hurr.

File Attachments

1) [BinThatKnife.jpg](#), downloaded 808 times



Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [Caveman](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 15:33:12 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ryu wrote on Wed, 25 June 2008 15:27 I mean, In Britain, it's great, I never worry someone is going to shoot me, and if someone did, when I'm being rushed to hospital at least I don't think to myself "Shit, will I be able to pay for this operation?"

But then we have to worry about knives.. which is a problem in London for the most part, proof:

Toggle Spoiler

That's how bad stabbing in London are, they need to add them around the city, lol.

I like gun control - and when the Government turns their back on us, 2000 citizens rushing a unsuspecting Military barracks is a guarantee for free weapons.

hurr hurr.

This is my point, anything that was made to intentionally kill someone should not be used by the general public. Guns, Knives and whatever else you can think off were designed with one purpose which was to cause serious harm to another person, they were not made for show and display. Unless you're some fucked up sick person why do you REALLY need such things?

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [SlikRik](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 15:39:57 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Take my guns and it's MORE likely that I'll kill you.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 15:47:10 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Do you people NOT realize that there are such things as criminals? You know, people that are out there to harm you whether it be physical, financially, or mentally? THAT is why people need guns. Plus, guns are great for defending yourself against tyrannical governments and for recreation and hunting.

If you leave the weapons to the police, you're leaving everything to a reactionary force. Reactionary forces only help after something has happened. A person on the street getting mugged can't exactly be helped by police. A person who has their house broken into doesn't have much time to react, let alone for a police force to react that's miles away. If the police could instantly teleport to the crime in progress, then I can start to see an argument against guns, but even then, you have to find a phone, call 911, talk to an operator about what's going on, and then the cops would have to be alerted, and then be transported. That's just in a fantasy world of cops using teleportation. Even then, all a person would have to do, that owns a gun, is find the gun, put the gun off safety, point the gun, pull the trigger. What response time is faster?

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 15:51:54 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You have to understand that a large number of us don't like the thought of being able to kill someone. I know there are some people I would happily shoot, thus I'm glad I can't.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 15:57:13 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Most of us aren't sociopaths, and most of us are law-abiding citizens. I don't hunt because I don't like the idea of taking the life of even an animal (I'm fine with others doing it, though). There's no way I'd feel good about ending the life of a human. However, in a dog eat dog world, I'm not going to let some asshole come into my life and harm me or my family. If you don't want to use a gun, nobody's asking you to own one. Just don't take away my right to defend myself the way I see fit. If someone wants to take away my rights, then they concede theirs.

If you wanted to kill people that badly, you would find a gun, regardless of laws. However, if not owning a gun makes you feel safer in terms of not being able to shoot and kill someone, then don't get a gun. I just know that I wouldn't pull the trigger on someone that pisses me off unless they were trespassing with the intent to do harm to my property, me, or my family.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 15:58:05 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

My fellow Englishmen, there is no point fighting with the yanks, they only care about themselves and not about anything or anyone else, they are kids and don't know any better.

Let them kill themselves in colleges and schools.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 15:58:20 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Taking guns away from criminals only makes them find another weapon to kill people with. Even if guns directly aren't the major problem, it'll turn into another weapon. Like knives.

However, keep taking shit away from the general public, and non-criminals are left defenseless.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 16:02:58 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

IronWarrior wrote on Wed, 25 June 2008 11:58My fellow Englishmen, there is no point fighting with the yanks, they only care about themselves and not about anything else or anyone else just a other blunt point, they too are kids and don't know any better.

Let them kill themselves in colleges and schools.

Wow, and Americans are the arrogant ones? Talk about the pot calling the kettle black.

Do you even know what the fuck you're talking about? What part of wanting to own a gun makes us only care about ourselves? I'm sorry we're not Utilitarian fucknuts. We, actually, believe that what someone earns, they deserve to keep. I know, it's a fucking CRAZY idea, but we also don't like the thought of someone else taking things from us, whether it be our property, the life of a family member, or our own life.

Actually, there's been perfect examples shooters being subdued by other students that ran out to their cars to grab their guns.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [Ghostshaw](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 16:04:24 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think americans are a bit hypocrite tbh. They are all in favor of free guns and all that freedom crap, but in the mean time they did allow some silly president to in state the patriot act, have the drinking age at 21 and whine about video games being to violent. IMO the last 3 things really speak off a lack of freedom or the intention to limit it.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 16:07:12 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

a lot of americans are idiots.
so are a lot of englishmen, germans, dutchs...
lets keep nations out of this, ok? 8]

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 16:07:56 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hypocritical? I'm against the Patriot Act. I HATE the drinking age being 21 (too bad, I wasn't born for another 8 years when it was changed...), and people can whine about violent games all they want, as long as the government doesn't enact legislation against them.

Also, those last three things are exactly why we, as citizens, want to KEEP our guns, so we can maintain the freedoms that we DO have, and perhaps even regain some lost ones.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [KIRBY-098](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 16:23:58 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 17:34:07 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Unfortunately the "best" arguments to own guns (stop tyrannical governments, protect yourself and all those other honourable reasons) are about as rare as the bad elements caused by the ease of access to guns. Someone going around shooting up a school is about as rare as requiring weapons to prevent such an act. You can't immediately dismiss the bad element as "rare and only applies to a limited number of people" when using the weapons for good are just as rare and limited.

Ultimately, you can't rely on the rare cases to decide such factors (some exceptions apply - such as when even the rare case hold too high of a cost). I am all for "show-guns" so long as they are not functioning. Want to own a high-powered assault rifle just for the sake of owning it? Go for it... just remove something that would prevent it from functioning. Yes, it is easy enough to make it functioning again, but that can be better regulated than stopping guns themselves.

Heck, I collect medieval-style weaponry (swords, daggers, etc.) and currently own 3 dulled Katanas (with poorly crafted blades as they are strictly for show), a number of daggers and even a few more modern hunting knives. Sure, I could get them sharpened, or even with my Cadet training sharpen them myself (well, at least the knives).

Edit: Point being, gun control is something that I think should be used, but needs to be re-evaluated and made more realistic. As much as it is ideal to rely on our fellow man to be a rational person, please... when you have companies that NEED to inform people that fresh coffee is hot, ironing clothes while still on the body is a bad idea, etc. it shows we are far from rational.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 17:44:22 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Then you completely ignore the simplest of arguments: Guns don't kill people. A properly functioning, high-powered rifle cannot kill people.

Face it, just about anything can be used as a murder weapon. I can kill people with my car. I can kill people with knives. I can kill people with scissors. I can kill people with my bare hands. I can kill people with a pen. I can kill people with my car keys. I can kill people with a chair. I can kill people with a toaster. I can kill people with a glass bottle. I can kill people with a golf club. I can kill people with a baseball bat. I can kill people with a plastic bag. I can kill people crowbar. I can kill people with a pillow. I think you guys get the point. If not, I'll name some more later.

Just because something CAN be used maliciously does not mean that it will. It is the responsibility of the individual to obey the law. Taking away the weapon does not take away the criminal intent.

Instead, it merely changes the weapon. If you can't trust yourself to be careful with a weapon, then don't buy the weapon. It's that simple.

The simple act of owning a gun does not impede on the rights of someone else, and it certainly shouldn't make someone a criminal. Again, I can use just about anything to impede on the rights of someone else. Only then, when I willfully impede on someone else's rights should I be considered a criminal, and not a second sooner.

Edit: People are only irrational because the government gives them the ability to be irrational. If you cradle a child, the child will always expect to be cradled. If someone is forced to rely on the government, they will never learn to take matters into their own hands. Regardless, I don't know about you, but I don't know anybody or anybody that knows someone who has created a frivolous lawsuit. Those lawsuits certainly do show the stupidity of some people, but that's all... just SOME. A minority shouldn't be enough to determine the fate of the vast majority.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 18:02:26 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:Guns don't kill people.

And I agree. People kill people. However, guns have one sole purpose: kill. "recreation" is simply a training exercises. You learn how to aim better. Cars, knives, etc. can be used to kill people, but are not designed to kill. "Kitchen knives" are designed to be used in the kitchen for cooking. "Other" knives are designed to be used as weapons and should rightfully be controlled (as I mentioned the knives I own have been designed with a dull edge... if you can call a flat surface an "edge")

Quote:If you can't trust yourself to be careful with a weapon, then don't buy the weapon. It's that simple.

Idealistic viewpoint. It's not that simple or people wouldn't be killed with weapons.

Quote:The simple act of owning a gun does not impede on the rights of someone else, and it certainly shouldn't make someone a criminal.

Never argued against that.

Quote:Those lawsuits certainly do show the stupidity of some people, but that's all... just SOME. A minority shouldn't be enough to determine the fate of the vast majority.

Unfortunately when you are dealing with the law, the minority WILL affect the majority. There is no way around it, that is how the system was designed. One person goes to court with a lawsuit (legitimate or not) and the result of that creates a precedent for future cases to be won (or lost) over. ONE person winning a case over spilled coffee now means that EVERYONE can sue if the same thing were to happen to them unless the defendant takes reasonable steps to ensure it

won't happen. ONE person sues over discrimination based on colour now means EVERYONE can sue over discrimination based on colour.

Just some reading to pass the time, not using these as proof of anything in this argument:

<http://www.legalzoom.com/legal-articles/article11331.html>

<http://www.canadafreepress.com/index.php/categories/C46>

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [Caveman](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 18:06:48 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 25 June 2008 18:44 Then you completely ignore the simplest of arguments: Guns don't kill people. A properly functioning, high-powered rifle cannot kill people.

Face it, just about anything can be used as a murder weapon. I can kill people with my car. I can kill people with knives. I can kill people with scissors. I can kill people with my bare hands. I can kill people with a pen. I can kill people with my car keys. I can kill people with a chair. I can kill people with a toaster. I can kill people with a glass bottle. I can kill people with a golf club. I can kill people with a baseball bat. I can kill people with a plastic bag. I can kill people with a crowbar. I can kill people with a pillow. I think you guys get the point. If not, I'll name some more later.

Just because something CAN be used maliciously does not mean that it will. It is the responsibility of the individual to obey the law. Taking away the weapon does not take away the criminal intent. Instead, it merely changes the weapon. If you can't trust yourself to be careful with a weapon, then don't buy the weapon. It's that simple.

The simple act of owning a gun does not impede on the rights of someone else, and it certainly shouldn't make someone a criminal. Again, I can use just about anything to impede on the rights of someone else. Only then, when I willfully impede on someone else's rights should I be considered a criminal, and not a second sooner.

Edit: People are only irrational because the government gives them the ability to be irrational. If you cradle a child, the child will always expect to be cradled. If someone is forced to rely on the government, they will never learn to take matters into their own hands. Regardless, I don't know about you, but I don't know anybody or anybody that knows someone who has created a frivolous lawsuit. Those lawsuits certainly do show the stupidity of some people, but that's all... just SOME. A minority shouldn't be enough to determine the fate of the vast majority.

You are missing my point... Yes a lot of things can be used as a murder weapon, but guns were made to kill people.. Chairs were made to sit on.. You cannot relate the two.. If someone breaks into my home and steals my computer or w/e im not gonna shoot him. If someone breaks into your home with a gun and is pointing at you.. even though you have a gun are you seriously gonna make a move for it and risk being killed? Hell no, let the thief take what he wants and you'll

more then likely come out of it alive but short on funds...

Im sorry if my way of living and disagreement with killing people doesn't quite live up to your lifestyle.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 18:07:16 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Guns are designed to kill, nothing else, why do you think wars become so deadly when armies started to be equipped with them, you only need to look at WW1 and WW2 to see how deadly they are.

One man armed with a simple mag fed rifle can kill 10x the number of people then a man armed with any other blunt weapon and 100x faster and any idiot can use it, hench why they are so popular and successful.

Back before the days of firearms, people had to train long hours with weapons to become good with them, take the long bow or crossbow, both weapons require a strong man, the long bow for exemple required years of training to be able to pull the string back and fire, the crossbow required power to pull the lock back, at long range, a arrow might defect off a persons armour, the arrow from a crossbow would go right through the armour from whatever range.

When the first guns and rifles started to be given out, they changed the face of warfare forever, since any farm boy could use it and kill anyone with it.

The fact is, guns are deadly, oh they may be objects but that means nothing, if you remove firearms from people, they would find it a hell alot harder to kill a other person.

Just to prove the fact, fly your fat american ass over here and we play two games.

First game, paint ball, we see how fast we can kill each other when we shooting at each other.

Second game, come at me with a stick in your hand and see how much I can put up a fight to live.

Against a firewarm, I have no defence, I can't block it, I can't defect it, he points the gun at me and fires and am dead.

You find it alot harder to kill me with a knife or some other blunt weapon.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 18:18:56 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

God, you two Europeans are just as thick as you claim I am.

I don't give a fuck if guns were designed to kill. Oh-fucking-well. That's beside the god damn point. The fact is, just about anything can be used to kill whether or not the fucking thing was intended for that purpose. Are you going to tell me that homosexuality is wrong because our genitals are for pro-creation? That's what they were intended for, right? Must mean there's no other reason to use them or have them.

Taking away a weapon doesn't always make murder harder. It just makes the person have to choose a different tactic. Sure, if I come running at you with a stick, I have no element of surprise. I could, then, just as easily come from behind you, slit your throat, and be done with it.

Not to mention that getting rid of guns from civilians doesn't change the fucking obvious point that CRIMINALS. WILL. STILL. HAVE. GUNS. Even if you had the government raid every household (talk about the invasion of privacy) to get rid of guns, that still doesn't change the fact that guns can be created out of raw materials (shall we ban steel, aluminum, brass, copper, etc... because it could be used to make weaponry?), let alone you will never be able to get rid of half of the guns out there.

If you're walking alone, and you have a gun, the smart thing would be to have your hand on your gun at all times. This removes the whole element of surprise on the attacker's part, as you're just as quick to draw your weapon.

Would you idiots stop insisting that an attacker is automatically going to shoot you? THAT'S NOT THE INTENT. If someone wants you dead, you really don't have much of a chance. Since that's not the general intent of a criminal, you'll generally have the upperhand, as you SHOULD have the desire to stay alive.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 18:30:02 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I would say you are ignorant.

I will not go into the fact that most gun crime is not planned and a gun was only used because they had one on their person, so remove the weapon, the chances of a deadly outcome from that crime is reduced with a deadly ending.

The fact that criminals might have guns is not a bearing on this, it is the Police's job to fix that problem and protect you not the other way around.

Have you ever thought why drink driving or driving while on drugs is against the law, the car is not a deadly weapon, but soon you start drinking, the man driving it becomes a weapon.

I don't see the point of taking this any further, there has been many topics about this before and always ended up in a shitfest.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 18:37:22 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yes, gun crimes are heat of the moment. However, let's take a look at who actually are the ones doing the shootings.

Prevalence of homicide and violent crime is greatest in urban areas of the United States.

The rising trend in homicide rates during the 1980s and early 1990s was most pronounced among youths and Hispanic and African American males in the United States, with the injury and death rates tripling for black males aged 13 through 17 and doubling for black males aged 18 through 24.

The rise in crack cocaine use in cities across the United States is often cited as a factor for increased gun violence among youths during this time period.

People with a criminal record are also more likely to die as homicide victims.

In Richmond, Virginia, the risk of gunshot injury is 22 times higher for those males involved with crime.

Judging from those points, it looks pretty good that in America, gun violence is majorly gang related. I would guess that most of these guys have guns that aren't legally owned, too.

Drunk driving becomes illegal because you're unable to control the vehicle, putting people in danger. Handling a gun, and using it for your protection only puts your attackers in danger.

Oh, and "Criminologist Gary Kleck compared various survey and proxy measures and found no correlation between overall firearm ownership and gun violence."

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 19:07:27 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Also, keep in mind that once mankind gets its hands on a better technology, he won't want to go back. You'd either have to remove guns from EVERYONE ("Hey every country that isn't ours, could you please remove your guns? Thanks!"), or just carry a gun with you aswell.

That's just how shit works. Correct me if I'm wrong, but there have been periods of time in the past where pretty much everyone carried a sword with them. Someone else going to kill you? You yourself had a weapon of equal ability to defend yourself most of the time.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 19:11:46 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Careful there. I'm not going to argue any points but "periods of time" means that people carried swords at one point in time when it was acceptable to do so and then the carrying of swords stopped (for whatever reason). Its fair to say that if you are going to use this as a reason, then you

have to acknowledge that at some point of time people will stop carrying guns to protect themselves.

Which opens the question of "why not do that now rather than later?"

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 19:13:21 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Cabal8616 wrote on Wed, 25 June 2008 15:07Also, keep in mind that once mankind gets its hands on a better technology, he won't want to go back. You'd either have to remove guns from EVERYONE ("Hey every country that isn't ours, could you please remove your guns? Thanks!"), or just carry a gun with you aswell

Not to mention the incredible invasion of buildings and properties that it would require to rid of guns. Sure, you could probably get some law-abiding citizens to give up their weapons, but good luck getting the weapons from criminals who aren't willing to give them up.

THEN we're back to the problem that the only guns in circulation are those in the hands of policy/military and criminals, and the police are only a reactionary force. How, then, are we to deal with these armed criminals?

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 19:24:40 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warranto wrote on Wed, 25 June 2008 14:11Careful there. I'm not going to argue any points but "periods of time" means that people carried swords at one point in time when it was acceptable to do so and then the carrying of swords stopped (for whatever reason). Its fair to say that if you are going to use this as a reason, then you have to acknowledge that at some point of time people will stop carrying guns to protect themselves.

Which opens the question of "why not do that now rather than later?"

It's been answered numerous times, both in this thread, and by many other people. It's just your personal willingness then to accept them as good reasons then.

But, for the most part, we're ALREADY being limited as it is. I rarely see guns strapped on the backs of people, which is understandable. Yeah, there's people with guns in pockets and etc, but I don't think I've ever seen a period of time in the past where weapons were pretty much limited, and it worked well for them.

Removing weapons from society just makes the problem worse. The only realistic way you can stop people from killing other people is by being the person who's attacked, and NOT being killed through whatever means.

Basically, you can't stop other people from being killed. Some way or another, people will be

murdered. It's inevitable, and by what means they murder is something that's ever changing.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 19:47:38 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Gun control laws simply do not work. Two reasons.

1. Assume you are a criminal who intends to use a gun to aid you in committing another crime. Murder, rape, armed robbery, whatever.

You have no regard whatsoever for society's laws regarding murder, rape, theft, etc. What incentive do you have to follow a law regarding guns? The only people who will be inclined to follow laws on guns will be law-abiding citizens; therefore, only criminals will have guns.

2. Again, assume you are an armed robber. The west side of the city you live in has gun control laws. The east side of the city does not.

Which store would you rather hold up? A store on the west side, where the proprietor won't have a shotgun behind the counter? Or a store on the east side, where the proprietor might have one?

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [KIRBY-098](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 20:08:00 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

End of story. So let's skip the idealism and let the citizenry have a method of self defense.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 20:10:13 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I've expressed myself at length on this subject quite a few times in the past. I believe that the single best deterrent to crime is the fear of immediate consequence, and that the best way to promise that is to allow the people- the pool of potential victims, the general populace, the sheep, if you will- to arm themselves. Crime would fall like a fucking rock if every gun control law were repealed tomorrow. The vast majority of all crime is committed by people who know what they are doing is wrong and do it anyway. They do what they do because it is easier than hard work and dedication and because they do not fear apprehension by police; why be afraid when you've got several minutes to an hour or more to get away?

I am a gun owner. I own six guns- three rifles, one shotgun, and two handguns. I plan to buy more as soon as I have the money to do so. Do I need all of those guns? No, I don't. For self defense, I would only need the handguns and the shotgun, and probably not even all three weapons. I also don't need a car with 4-wheel-drive, a computer that can play the latest games, my knife collection, my sword, or most of the other stuff I own. Need doesn't come into play; neither the

government nor anyone else has the right to deny me these things unless I have proven myself a threat to the people around me. They don't get to tell me what I may or may not own, and for what purpose (again, provided that I do not use it to harm others). That is not the right of government, and it is not the right of my fellow citizens. Call me whatever you will; you do not have the right to disarm me.

Additionally, though guns are indeed weapons, they do not make people willing to kill. They do not tempt people to kill. They make it easier to kill, but the human urges which drive such acts will or won't be present regardless of access to guns or other weapons. Wolves will be wolves, and sheep will be sheep. I know the wolves are out there, so why the hell shouldn't I have access to the most effective means of keeping them at bay? I've yet to hear a single good argument. All of them stem from tearjerking bullshit that ignores reality and human nature.

Would I kill someone who presents a threat to me, my home, or my family? Yes, I would. Would I kill someone because they pissed me off and I hate them? No, I wouldn't. Know why? Because I have self control. I recognize that other people have the same rights I do, which is what forms the basis of any civilized society. If you believe that you would kill people who you don't like simply because you don't like them, then I pity you. You're a pathetic excuse for a human being. Keep your hands and your laws off my guns and out of my fucking home.

As for you twerps across the pond- take a look at your crime rates. Take a good, hard look. Compare them to those places in the US that have right-to-carry laws. Compare them to Switzerland, for fuck's sake. If you don't see the connection, then there's nothing I can say to convince you. You are a lost cause. Feel free to go on ranting about the so-called evils of guns, but also feel free to keep your invasive, draconian government on your side of the Atlantic. Ours is bad enough already.

There are an awful lot of things that I am very open minded about, but this is not one of them. This is an issue that does have a right and a wrong- the numbers prove it, common sense proves it. There is no link, no evidence, that I can show to you that will change your mind, because if you will not see the facts that are right in front of your face then you are delusional. It is not entirely your own fault; you have been brainwashed, one way or another, into believing that guns = crime. I understand why it makes sense to you, but the gun control viewpoint is in the same category as Communism- it only works so long as everybody agrees to abide by it. It only works so long as there are not people who believe themselves above or outside the system. People like criminals, people like the politicians who hypocritically denounce gun ownership and yet waltz around with armed guards. The ideal of a peaceful society is great on paper, but it simply does not work. Unless they are given a reason to be good and just, people will continue not to be. Guns are that reason. They are the means with which those who are good and just keep those who are not from harming the rest of society.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [mr£\\$Å-z](#)

on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 20:11:41 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nukelt15 wrote on Wed, 25 June 2008 15:10Nukelt's Post... bla bla

WTF

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 20:23:55 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nukelt15 wrote on Wed, 25 June 2008 16:10 I've expressed myself at length on this subject quite a few times in the past. I believe that the single best deterrent to crime is the fear of immediate consequence, and that the best way to promise that is to allow the people- the pool of potential victims, the general populace, the sheep, if you will- to arm themselves. Crime would fall like a fucking rock if every gun control law were repealed tomorrow. The vast majority of all crime is committed by people who know what they are doing is wrong and do it anyway. They do what they do because it is easier than hard work and dedication and because they do not fear apprehension by police; why be afraid when you've got several minutes to an hour or more to get away?

I am a gun owner. I own six guns- three rifles, one shotgun, and two handguns. I plan to buy more as soon as I have the money to do so. Do I need all of those guns? No, I don't. For self defense, I would only need the handguns and the shotgun, and probably not even all three weapons. I also don't need a car with 4-wheel-drive, a computer that can play the latest games, my knife collection, my sword, or most of the other stuff I own. Need doesn't come into play; neither the government nor anyone else has the right to deny me these things unless I have proven myself a threat to the people around me. They don't get to tell me what I may or may not own, and for what purpose (again, provided that I do not use it to harm others). That is not the right of government, and it is not the right of my fellow citizens. Call me whatever you will; you do not have the right to disarm me.

Additionally, though guns are indeed weapons, they do not make people willing to kill. They do not tempt people to kill. They make it easier to kill, but the human urges which drive such acts will or won't be present regardless of access to guns or other weapons. Wolves will be wolves, and sheep will be sheep. I know the wolves are out there, so why the hell shouldn't I have access to the most effective means of keeping them at bay? I've yet to hear a single good argument. All of them stem from tearjerking bullshit that ignores reality and human nature.

Would I kill someone who presents a threat to me, my home, or my family? Yes, I would. Would I kill someone because they pissed me off and I hate them? No, I wouldn't. Know why? Because I have self control. I recognize that other people have the same rights I do, which is what forms the basis of any civilized society. If you believe that you would kill people who you don't like simply because you don't like them, then I pity you. You're a pathetic excuse for a human being. Keep your hands and your laws off my guns and out of my fucking home.

As for you twerps across the pond- take a look at your crime rates. Take a good, hard look. Compare them to those places in the US that have right-to-carry laws. Compare them to Switzerland, for fuck's sake. If you don't see the connection, then there's nothing I can say to convince you. You are a lost cause. Feel free to go on ranting about the so-called evils of guns,

but also feel free to keep your invasive, draconian government on your side of the Atlantic. Ours is bad enough already.

There are an awful lot of things that I am very open minded about, but this is not one of them. This is an issue that does have a right and a wrong- the numbers prove it, common sense proves it. There is no link, no evidence, that I can show to you that will change your mind, because if you will not see the facts that are right in front of your face then you are delusional. It is not entirely your own fault; you have been brainwashed, one way or another, into believing that guns = crime. I understand why it makes sense to you, but the gun control viewpoint is in the same category as Communism- it only works so long as everybody agrees to abide by it. It only works so long as there are not people who believe themselves above or outside the system. People like criminals, people like the politicians who hypocritically denounce gun ownership and yet waltz around with armed guards. The ideal of a peaceful society is great on paper, but it simply does not work. Unless they are given a reason to be good and just, people will continue not to be. Guns are that reason. They are the means with which those who are good and just keep those who are not from harming the rest of society.

My dad said that since Michigan passed it's CCW law, he feels like he has to duck and cover while downtown. Wait... no, he didn't. He said he doesn't feel any less safe than he did when Michigan didn't have it's CCW law. Hmm...

Ohh, and you hit the nail on the head, yet again, Nukelt.

SpoonyThe only people who will be inclined to follow laws on guns will be law-abiding citizens; therefore, only criminals will have guns.

I have yet to be given a good defense to this. Hell, now that I think of it, I don't recall ever been given a response to this.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 20:42:06 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

madrackz wrote on Wed, 25 June 2008 15:11Nukelt15 wrote on Wed, 25 June 2008 15:10Nukelt's Post... bla bla

WTF

oh, poor madrackz, to stupid to read.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 21:28:38 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 25 June 2008 13:37Oh, and "Criminologist Gary Kleck compared various survey and proxy measures and found no correlation between overall firearm ownership

and gun violence."

The irony there is obvious.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 22:20:26 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 25 June 2008 14:23SpoonyThe only people who will be inclined to follow laws on guns will be law-abiding citizens; therefore, only criminals will have guns. I have yet to be given a good defense to this. Hell, now that I think of it, I don't recall ever been given a response to this.

This is not my personal belief (I've already stated mine), but a response to this could be:

Crime involving guns in America has not become non-existent by both sides holding weapons. You have an equal weapon to defend yourself should the need arise, yes. But there is no MAD (Mutually Assured Destruction)-mentality going on here. Rather the opposite happens. It ensures the gun will be fired. Much of the time the gun is used for purposes of intimidation with no intent of being fired. By producing your own weapon you intensify the situation into a stand-off scenario. Sure, there will be times that the individual backs off when they see their target is armed, but not always. At this point it comes down to personal behavior. The individual may decide to pursue the action, at which point either producing the weapon will be seen as an act of desperation with no intent to use, or it is fired.

If it is fired, it better be to kill because the criminal you just fired at WILL fire back.

Now lets take your gun away. If the criminal was going to shoot regardless, then holding a weapon would do nothing to deter the person.

The best scenario to come out of this is that producing the weapon causes a would-be shooter to back off. However, I would stake that this is one of those "rare" instances talked about before. Since it is a "rare" instance, it can't really be used to determine the outcome that everyone should face.

The point being that the existence of a gun is more likely to intensify than defuse a situation. The criminals will always have guns. But the law-abiding people having them as well does little to ensure your own safety most of the time.

Edit: fixed the quote

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 22:36:27 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Pacifism? I'll admit that material things aren't worth risking your life for, but pacifism takes that to the extreme. Even then, the whole ordeal is left to the victim to decide whether or not the fight is worth it. The government certainly shouldn't be able to step in and say, "you can't make that judgment call."

Even if gun ownership DIDN'T make people safer (which can easily be proven that it HAS), it certainly hasn't created any more violence, and thus has no reason to be banned.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [trooprm02](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 23:03:49 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Few things:

1)The need for the 2nd amendment was during a civil war with the occupying country, it was needed. However many years later, last time I checked the US is not at war with the British on their soil.

2)That said, I still support a citizens right to do w/e the fuck they want, including own/stockpile weapons. Restricting that right (not necessarily the 2nd ammendment) is a form of totalitarianism.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 23:58:52 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Wow, I actually agree with troop... except for his 1st point. The founding fathers knew what a tyrannical government would do, and they wanted to protect the citizens' rights to defend themselves from a tyrannical government, especially their own. While England may not be our overbearing government, the US government is becoming that way.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 00:20:24 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Although, I wonder how this would have played out if the guy did not have easy access to guns:

Man kills 5 in Kentucky

Not using it as proof of anything, but curious as to what people think the access to guns played in this.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 00:25:23 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:That said, I still support a citizens right to do w/e the fuck they want, including own/stockpile weapons. Restricting that right (not necessarily the 2nd ammendment) is a form of totalitarianism.

Rather minor totalitarianism than a survival of the fittest style anarchy.

If Nietzsche was right about anything its that people will take every inch they can grab at the expense of those they step on to get there.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [SlikRik](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 00:30:25 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

People who decide to go on shooting sprees followed by suicide obviously have something wrong with them to begin with. Your point is a valid one, the "ease" of access to guns I'd say did have a part to play in this. A guy as unstable as this guy or guys like him obviously shouldn't be able to easily get weapons. However, unless you want to give everyone who purchases a gun a psych evaluation, it will be nearly impossible to determine who these people are. As unfortunate as these incidents are, I don't think they are a good basis to remove the right to buy and bear arms from an entire nation. As horrible as it is to say, the percentage of people who have been killed from shooting sprees such as this one to the entire population of the country is incredibly small, and therefore in my opinion an unjustified reason.

Also, @ the picture in the article: does that red stain on the ground closely resemble a dried pool of blood, or is that just me? lol

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [GoArmy44](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 00:39:42 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Caveman wrote on Wed, 25 June 2008 06:49Guns were made to kill people...Therefore they should be illegal to have and yes before anyone says so were XYZ should those be banned to.. Simple answer, yes.

Black powder muskets, breach loading rifles, 20 gauge shotguns with birdshot, and elephant guns...all mass human killing machines!

I'm sure this point and in fact this entire subject has been beaten to death, but in the end guns serve to empower the people to defend themselves and their property against aggressors, even the all powerful all knowing government.

Gun Control advocates tend to have a naive faith in the good intentions of government, relying on other people to protect their natural right to life. Now I know we have police to do that, but they are not omnipresent and can not possibly defend you at all times in all places.

In the end I believe that there are three main reasons why a person should be able to own a firearm, the first is protecting property, ensuring power to the people to overthrow the government if it ever becomes necessary and for sports such as hunting or other shooting sports activities.

"Government is not reason, it is not eloquent; it is force. Like fire, it is a dangerous servant and a fearful master."

~George Washington

PS: Thanks Cheesesoda, I have been undecided on who I was going to vote for this November since Paul dropped out, I was thinking Constitution Party since their candidate was a big supporter of Paul but my state has a ridiculous ballot petitioning process (toughest in the US), I had heard about Barr but didn't really look into him until I saw your signature link. Now I am pretty certain who my choice is.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 00:47:44 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warrantoCrime involving guns in America has not become non-existent by both sides holding weapons.

Crime will never become non-existent. There is always that element which wishes to subvert or circumvent the rules of society in order to advance itself, no matter who gets hurt along the way.

The largest flaw in this bit of your post has to do with generalization. You simply cannot take the crime statistics for the US as a whole as you can for some other countries. Because of how the US is organized, gun laws vary greatly from state to state and even from city to city. However, the consistent fact is that in those areas where private ownership of guns- especially handguns- is severely restricted or banned, the crime rate is higher in comparison with areas that have no such restrictions. Yes, when set against the entire US population, there are a lot of registered gun owners. However, most of these people are not living in the areas that have the highest crime; likewise, the highest concentrations of violent crime involving illegally owned weapons tend to occur in those places which don't have very many legal gun owners. There's a pattern here somewhere, and I'm not at all convinced that enough people are seeing it- which is a terrible shame for folks living in Trenton, Camden, NYC, Washington DC, Chicago, and other hotspots.

Quote:But there is no MAD (Mutually Assured Destruction)-mentality going on here. Rather the opposite happens. It ensures the gun will be fired. Much of the time the gun is used for purposes of intimidation with no intent of being fired.

Guns are very effective intimidation- when the person they are pointed at has no gun of their own.

You are correct here; when one person with a weapon sees that the other also has a weapon, there is a much higher chance that one or the other will fire. There is an unspoken assumption on the part of either party that the other must be willing to use the weapon they possess; otherwise they wouldn't have brought it along. Whether that weapon is a gun or a knife, the threat response changes drastically when the victim is also armed- rather than trying to reason with the attacker or escape, the would-be victim instead fights back. The presence of a second weapon changes everything- the playing field is leveled, and whether or not the other will be intimidated is entirely dependent on their personality after this happens. This is a good thing, if only because the vast majority of crime is committed by cowardly people (the fact that they attack those who they believe to be unarmed testifies to their cowardice) who are far more likely to be intimidated by the presence of a gun. They don't want to die; they want a pushover- and that pushover just pushed back.

Quote:If it is fired, it better be to kill because the criminal you just fired at WILL fire back.

Any handgun defense course will teach you that there are only two targets worth shooting for- center of mass, or the head. Center of mass because, if you are using a larger caliber weapon (in practice, pretty much anything bigger or punchier than a .380 ACP), there is a very good chance that a CoM shot will put your target on the ground unless they are either Superman or so whacked out on drugs that they keep coming anyway. Head, because as we all know there is absolutely no chance of the criminal firing back if they are dead. The standard FBI/law enforcement training target lacks arms and legs for exactly this reason: a nonlethal shot is an ideal, not a reality.

Quote:If the criminal was going to shoot regardless, then holding a weapon would do nothing to deter the person.

Simply holding it? No, that won't do shit. That's not the point. If you have a weapon, and you have the shot, use it, or there's no damn point to having brought it out in the first place. If the bad guy has already drawn or is about to draw on you, your imperative is to get your weapon out and fire it before they do the same. Your chances of survival go way down if they've already drawn theirs, but they cease to exist if you don't try.

Quote:The best scenario to come out of this is that producing the weapon causes a would-be shooter to back off.

...which is to say that the next best thing would be that you kill the criminal and survive, the next best under that being that you are injured and the criminal is either gone or dead, and beneath that are the worst-case scenarios in which the criminal comes out on top and you have either been driven off, injured, or killed. We all know what the best-case scenario is. The best chance of attaining it- or any positive outcome at all- lies in being armed.

Quote:The point being that the existence of a gun is more likely to intensify than defuse a situation.

The presence of a gun does not cause a crisis situation to escalate; that escalation is exactly what calls for the gun's presence. If you have a need for the gun in the first place, the time for peaceful resolution has come and gone already. This is the situation in which, if you don't have a gun, you sure as hell wish you did. That type of crisis can happen whether you have it or not, and it is far,

far better for your chances of survival to have it.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 15:34:47 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

MUAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA.... Supreme Court ruled on the Second Amendment today. Oh yeah, Americans have the right to guns for self-defense and hunting. \o/

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [SlikRik](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 15:51:40 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

YEA BOIIIIII!!

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 16:36:54 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I heard about that ruling; it pleases me greatly. This is conclusive; the Supreme Court agrees that the Second Amendment does apply to an individual and not a collective right.

It's not all good news, though; the ruling does not affect existing laws against CCW in places like DC, just whether or not guns may be kept within the home. It's still a step forward, but more progress needs to be made.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 17:17:59 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SlikRik wrote on Thu, 26 June 2008 10:51 YEA BOIIIIII!!
damn you, i just found out and was about to post it

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 18:03:54 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I just got back to this thread.

I don't feel like quoting. Cheesesoda disagreed with me saying that he should have the right to own a sniper or high powered assault rifle.

I never said you couldn't. I just said that there should be more heavy requirements for you to get them. There is no reason for a specific type of gun when all guns do the job of self defense. So if you can defend yourself with a simple handgun, why should you want a high-powered assault rifle?

That is why I proposed having heavier requirements for said weapons. For example, if you wanted to own a sniper you would either have to have a hunting license that says you can have one, or a military license, or something similar.

I'm not saying ban the use of such weapons. I'm merely saying such weapons aren't as necessary in a civilian society therefore should be harder to obtain.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 18:27:28 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

What if I don't hunt, haven't been in the military, but I want to use long range rifles on shooting ranges? I don't see why I would need any more than a gun license from a simple background check that would take just a few minutes.

If Iron Warrior is right about most shootings being spur of the moment incidents, then it would be even more reasonable to say that there should be LESS restriction on sniper rifles because it would take a special, cold, and calculated person to perform such acts. I don't know you, but I don't know any sociopaths.

As far as gun control goes, I might agree with some licensing. I mean, violent felons and sociopaths probably shouldn't be given weapons. However, even the most violently tempered humans will generally stop before they kill someone. Plus, those that are willing to kill, they won't waste time getting their weapon registered. They'll get an illegal weapon and use it.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 18:50:54 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If you want to use it in a shooting range you rent the gun at the shooting range and return it when you are done.

And you're putting words in my mouth. I never said ANYTHING about criminals using such weapons for attacking other people. And like I said, it isn't harming anyone to put a restriction on heavy weapons because you only need a light weapon to defend yourself. Tell me, if you wanted a gun for self defense, why should you get an assault rifle instead of a revolver?

All you've been saying is how banning weapons doesn't stop killers and how banning weapons only harms people who want to defend themselves... but I have never said anything relating to that.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [SlikRik](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 18:58:46 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Thu, 26 June 2008 14:50 If you want to use it in a shooting range you rent the gun at the shooting range and return it when you are done.

....

Tell me, if you wanted a gun for self defense, why should you get an assault rifle instead of a revolver?

To the first part, you can bring your own gun to shooting ranges. If the shooting range didn't have the specific gun I wanted to shoot available for rent, I'd go out and buy my own.

To the second part:

To make sure the motherfucker is dead!!

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 19:07:21 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

For your first part: It works the same at any other product retailer. If they don't have what you're looking for, go somewhere else. If there isn't anywhere else, then you're crap out of luck.

You ever hear the term 2 wrongs don't make a right? There is a less chance of you killing the person your trying to defend yourself against if you use a light weapon.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [SlikRik](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 19:23:33 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Thu, 26 June 2008 15:07 You ever hear the term 2 wrongs don't make a right? There is a less chance of you killing the person your trying to defend yourself against if you use a light weapon.

No shit. That's why I'm saying I'd want an assault rifle to make sure the attacker is dead lol. You missed my attempted humor.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 19:48:16 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Thu, 26 June 2008 14:50 If you want to use it in a shooting range you rent the gun at the shooting range and return it when you are done.

And you're putting words in my mouth. I never said ANYTHING about criminals using such weapons for attacking other people. And like I said, it isn't harming anyone to put a restriction on heavy weapons because you only need a light weapon to defend yourself. Tell me, if you wanted a gun for self defense, why should you get an assault rifle instead of a revolver?

All you've been saying is how banning weapons doesn't stop killers and how banning weapons only harms people who want to defend themselves... but I have never said anything relating to that.

Uhh, if the business allows me to bring my own sniper rifle to the range, why the fuck would I have to rely on just them having it? It doesn't harm anyone by me owning it.

I don't want a high powered rifle over a hand gun. It's not about self-defense. I want my sniper rifle for recreation, competition, and possibly hunting (obviously, no .50 cal for hunting).

My whole argument against criminals is that the only reason why you would restrict something is if it massively endangers the public. Otherwise, that's an oppressive government.

No, there's no need for an assault rifle or a sniper rifle. That's all beside the point. I made a point earlier about having things in excess. Should we not be allowed to purchase things in the excess if we wish to? I'm going to buy a new laptop once I sell my current one. I have a desktop that works just fine. Are you going to tell me that I should have no right to purchase an expensive gaming rig, even if I'm only going to play Renegade on it, and nothing newer than that? Yes, it's in excess, and there's not necessarily a point to having it, but should I not be allowed?

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 20:05:54 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think we'd be a lot safer from robbery and stuff if you HAVE to have a gun in your house by law.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 20:54:02 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

One city does have that as law, but they don't enforce it.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 21:41:30 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cheesesoda wrote on Thu, 26 June 2008 15:48

Uhh, if the business allows me to bring my own sniper rifle to the range, why the fuck would I have to rely on just them having it? It doesn't harm anyone by me owning it.....

Seriously, you're replying to arguments I'm not even making!

I never said anything about not being allowed to own one! I only said make getting one harder!

If you want one badly enough, you just need to take a proper course in using one, that is all I'm saying. Guns are just like everything else, I don't understand why they need special treatment.

Look at cars. You get a drivers license and you get to drive specific types of cars, but if you want to drive another type of vehicle, like a plane, a trucker, or a boat, you need to get another license for doing so. Why not apply this system to guns as well? Your right to bare arms isn't infringed because you aren't losing the ability to own a gun. If you only want a gun for self defense, you can get one using the current system. If you wanted a stronger weapon for recreation, that's fine too, but you just need more requirements to get them.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 23:02:17 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Do us all a big favor and never go into politics. You clearly don't have the faintest fucking clue why government being able to dictate rights and needs to the people is a horrid idea, and I sincerely hope that you are never in a position for your ignorance to piss on my freedom.

HERE'S THE BOTTOM FUCKING LINE: NEITHER THE GOVERNMENT NOR ANY CITIZEN OR GROUP OF CITIZENS HAS ANY RIGHT WHATSOEVER TO TELL ANOTHER CITIZEN WHAT THEY MAY OR MAY NOT DO OR POSSESS, FOR ANY REASON, UNLESS THAT INDIVIDUAL IS CONVICTED OF A CRIME OR ADJUDICATED AS A DANGER TO THE REST OF SOCIETY. NOWHERE IN OUR CONSTITUTION DOES IT STATE THAT ANY CITIZEN MUST PROVIDE JUSTIFICATION FOR ANY ACTION, ANY PURCHASE, ANY DECISION THAT THEY MAKE AS A PREREQUISITE FOR MAKING IT. NEITHER THE GOVERNMENT NOR ANY OTHER ENTITY HAS THE RIGHT TO DENY ANYTHING AT ALL WHICH DOES NOT DIRECTLY HARM ANOTHER CITIZEN OR SOCIETY AS A WHOLE. ANYTHING, INCLUDING PARKING A TANK IN THEIR FUCKING DRIVEWAY OR PAINTING BIG SHINY RAINBOWS ON THEIR FRONT WALK. NOBODY HAS THE RIGHT TO TAKE ANY OF THAT AWAY UNLESS THE PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR IT CAUSES OR ALLOWS HARM TO BE DONE BY IT.

My apologies for shouting, but some people here really seem to be that dense.

I do not want Big Brother telling me what guns I may or may not own. Our Founding Fathers did not want Big Brother telling people what guns they may or may not own. When a government

starts telling people what they may or may not own, unless someone else's rights are violated as a direct consequence of that ownership (as in slavery), it has overstepped its bounds. Laws requiring registration, authorization, or restriction violate the principle of Innocent Until Proven Guilty, and therefore violate the beliefs upon which our nation was founded. Government serves the people, it does not tell them what to do. It does not sacrifice freedom for security. I can't fathom how the fuck we ever forgot that.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 23:31:18 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nukelt15I can't fathom how the fuck we ever forgot that.

The World Wars, The Great Depression, and the counter-culture. The past century has been a huge blow to the principles that our nation was founded upon.

Though, the spirit of liberty is not dead within America. I'm pleasantly surprised to see what good Ron Paul has done for the libertarian/Constitutionalist message. The message is getting louder, too.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Fri, 27 Jun 2008 02:01:46 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nukelt15 wrote on Thu, 26 June 2008 19:02BIG RED TEXT

Please explain to me then, if they aren't allowed to do such things, why do we need driver's licenses to drive cars? Trucks? Planes? Why we need Hunting Licenses to go hunting? Why we have to be of a certain age to start drinking? Why we can get arrested for possessing drugs? Why gays can't get married in most states? Why people are shot simply by walking on government property? Why we need a passport to leave the country? Why you can get arrested for using or being aligned with using a swastika? Why you aren't allowed to do anything to the flag? Why there have been video games deemed "too violent" or "too mature" to be allowed sales in the United States? Why it is illegal to possess child pornography? Or why the government bans or restricts the use of hundreds of thousands of other things?

I don't get why you guys keep on coming back at me saying that I said "Omg they should ban this and that cause of this reason and that reason!"

I never said they should ban anything! All I said is that there should be a heavier requirement for owning high-powered rifles that aren't going to be used for self defense.

If you have a problem with that, that means you have a problem with drinking ages and drivers licenses too. Because the way I see it, it would still take much longer for a person to acquire a drivers license than a permit to use heavy weapons. I don't understand why you guys aren't grasping the point: you should be trained in its use before you can start using it. Do you seriously want a guy, living in the city, who has never held a gun before in his life, to purchase an M16 for

"recreational" purposes without any training in how to use it?(An by training I mean 1 or 2 simple 4-5 hour classes)

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 27 Jun 2008 02:32:48 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The answer to your last question: yes. Why? Because, with great reason, he would not be allowed to use it within a city. If he's an idiot and wants to cut down a tree with it, he should be allowed to, as long as he's not close enough to hit someone else's house (out in the burbs).

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Fri, 27 Jun 2008 02:41:50 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ok, so lets say he doesn't take into consideration the force behind firing the weapon and in the backlash accidentally shoots someone else or breaks someone else's belongings.

I really don't see the big deal. If people can wait 1-2 years for a drivers license, people can sit through a few classes on how to use the gun and in what situations.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Fri, 27 Jun 2008 02:45:22 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nukelt15 wrote on Thu, 26 June 2008 18:02Do us all a big favor and never go into politics. You clearly don't have the faintest fucking clue why government being able to dictate rights and needs to the people is a horrid idea, and I sincerely hope that you are never in a position for your ignorance to piss on my freedom.

HERE'S THE BOTTOM FUCKING LINE: NEITHER THE GOVERNMENT NOR ANY CITIZEN OR GROUP OF CITIZENS HAS ANY RIGHT WHATSOEVER TO TELL ANOTHER CITIZEN WHAT THEY MAY OR MAY NOT DO OR POSSESS, FOR ANY REASON, UNLESS THAT INDIVIDUAL IS CONVICTED OF A CRIME OR ADJUDICATED AS A DANGER TO THE REST OF SOCIETY. NOWHERE IN OUR CONSTITUTION DOES IT STATE THAT ANY CITIZEN MUST PROVIDE JUSTIFICATION FOR ANY ACTION, ANY PURCHASE, ANY DECISION THAT THEY MAKE AS A PREREQUISITE FOR MAKING IT. NEITHER THE GOVERNMENT NOR ANY OTHER ENTITY HAS THE RIGHT TO DENY ANYTHING AT ALL WHICH DOES NOT DIRECTLY HARM ANOTHER CITIZEN OR SOCIETY AS A WHOLE. ANYTHING, INCLUDING PARKING A TANK IN THEIR FUCKING DRIVEWAY OR PAINTING BIG SHINY RAINBOWS ON THEIR FRONT WALK. NOBODY HAS THE RIGHT TO TAKE ANY OF THAT AWAY UNLESS THE PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR IT CAUSES OR ALLOWS HARM TO BE DONE BY IT.

My apologies for shouting, but some people here really seem to be that dense.

I do not want Big Brother telling me what guns I may or may not own. Our Founding Fathers did not want Big Brother telling people what guns they may or may not own. When a government starts telling people what they may or may not own, unless someone else's rights are violated as a direct consequence of that ownership (as in slavery), it has overstepped its bounds. Laws requiring registration, authorization, or restriction violate the principle of Innocent Until Proven Guilty, and therefore violate the beliefs upon which our nation was founded. Government serves the people, it does not tell them what to do. It does not sacrifice freedom for security. I can't fathom how the fuck we ever forgot that.

That is the danger of excessive individuality and freedom. 100% freedom will lead only to more strife...in ALL things moderation is required.

We are all God's creatures and with our given higher intelligence, we are complex beings capable of a wide range of thought and emotions...we are not robots.

The thing that bothers me the most about your post is the almost complete negligence of the neighbor. It is all about yourself and yourself and yourself? I thought humanity grew out of that mentality thousands of years ago with the dawn of civilization...I guess we want to go back?

You see, you CAN be a responsible man, you CAN be an intelligent man, you CAN be a man of understanding and all that by itself will ensure that you CAN be a man who can safely keep a nuclear warhead in his basement for "recreational" purposes or just because he can...but you think your neighbors will be able to sleep at night? This is the reason governments came into existence in the first place: to resolve the issue of fear in the people.

We will be all animals overnight if such massive amounts of freedoms are allowed. Men MUST be governed but in all things moderation should be the norm.

Having a government is like a tug of war. Both need to keep the other in perfect check and both need the other for survival. The people recognize the government for without recognition, the government is nothing. The government in turn, respects the people (as they ought to) to get respect from the people in return. Have no government to govern and there WILL be chaos. Having only people will be a greater strife.

You cannot support the Founding Fathers and the Constitution and yet demand more ridiculous individual liberties. You cannot apply late-1700 norms to that of today to further your cause. The Founding Fathers did not know what a 7.62 mm assault rifle was and they did not know what a .50 cal sniper rifle was...I bet my soul that if they foresaw the creation of those weapons and their incredible ability to kill several dozen people per minute, I am sure they would have put a limiting clause in the Constitution.

Regarding the red text, if you want to do whatever you want to do and yet live under the protective security and benefits of a united society, then I would say your best bet is to start your own society. The active nuclear warhead collector, the neighborhood tank-collecting freak, and the backyard sniper rifle shooter can all live in one place without anyone telling them what to do.

EDIT: I made small correction.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Fri, 27 Jun 2008 02:56:45 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Also realize that the "freedom" you guys are speaking of is not do whatever the hell you want with no restrictions and not get in trouble for it. The "freedom" is the ability to live without the overbearing stress of restrictions that are faced in many other countries.

The thing with America is that there are restrictions, but they aren't stressful to the people. What I mean by that is that restrictions are placed with consent of the people. The government can't just decide something is not right for the people and ban them from using it. There needs to be consent from the people... hence the reason we are having this discussion in the first place. If the freedom was gone, there would be no point in us, the people, discussing the laws relating to gun control at all... because the government would just do as they please with those laws without our consent.

If I was going against liberty and freedom by proposing a restriction, then I don't know what liberty and freedom is.

It's alright for you to have your freedoms with your heavy assault rifles, but it isn't ok for me to have my freedom in disapproval of you having it?

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 27 Jun 2008 03:47:30 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You can have your disapproval all you want, as long as you don't impede on my right to own one through legislation when I'm not impeding on your rights or the rights of anybody else.

Personally, I don't agree with Hobbes. I don't think that the state of nature is chaos. I think that small, prosperous communities would arise. People have a desire to support their friends and family. As much as people want to think that people are entirely selfish, there is a bit of altruism.

Anarchy is not a horrible form of "government". My only problem with anarchy is that it will beget several, small governments, defeating the purpose.

Fear isn't what makes people give up their power to the Leviathan. People just have grown to be social creatures, and very specialized in skill sets, so an economy and government form from that.

As far as the government is concerned, it's only job is to protect its citizens from threats, be they domestic or foreign. As long as my actions do not impede on the rights of others, I should have absolutely no interference from my government WHATSOEVER. My actions, be they moral or immoral, according to ANY moral set is irrelevant. Only I am responsible for my actions. My government is not my parent, nor do I wish it to be. If someone wants their decisions to be made for them, they can hire someone to plan their day. I will not partake in such utter disregard for life.

Government only gives enough liberty to its citizens, so that there won't be any mass rebellion.

Government knows that the more liberty citizens have, the less control over the people that they have. Some of you view it necessary for there to be a balance struck, but the government should always be able to be swatted like a fly by its citizens. The citizens give the government its powers, and allowing for these ridiculous restrictions on personal liberties only makes the people less powerful.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Fri, 27 Jun 2008 11:08:52 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I find it amusing that Canada has lower gun related deaths than U.S. and has almost as high gun per capita. (In case you want to source, it's here.)

The data I want to point out is this, "Firearm Homicide" the U.S. have 3.72 x100,000 rate, while Canada have 0.72x100,000. This is 14 year old data, but the more accurate 2008 data would probably reflect the same thing.

Edit: Scroll to the bottom, and see a graph of gun related deaths.

<http://www.cdc.gov/MMWR/preview/mmwrhtml/00046149.htm>

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 27 Jun 2008 11:31:14 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm going to go out on a limb and blame America's Drug War.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Fri, 27 Jun 2008 13:18:08 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cheesesoda wrote on Thu, 26 June 2008 23:47 You can have your disapproval all you want liberties only makes the people less powerful.

So what is your take on drivers licenses? Do you support the idea of a government controlled system in which, only through time and a series of tests, you are legally allowed to drive a car?

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 27 Jun 2008 13:31:09 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Don't misquote me like that, please.

As for your question, the concept of driving cars is a bit different than shooting guns. Do I think people should have a license to drive a car on their own property and not on public roads? No, I don't. However, it should be illegal to drive without a license on public roads and in populated areas. This being for the same reason why it's not illegal to shoot a gun in the country, but it is in the city.

I don't know about you, but when I buy my gun, I'm not going to be wielding it in the street and firing shots. That's reckless endangerment of others' lives. The same would go for driving without the slightest fucking clue as to what you're doing. However, if you want to shoot yourself in the foot in the country, be my guest. If you want to drive your vehicle into trees on your property, be my guest.

It's either that, or just make the penalties high for those that cause crashes, and get rid of "no fault insurance" laws (like in my stupid state of Michigan). Most people will be smart enough to not operate the vehicle in a manner to where it would endanger others and that could land them hefty fines. Of course, most people are smart enough to not drive drunk, too. There are exceptions, of course, and for reckless endangerment of others, penalties should be high.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Fri, 27 Jun 2008 13:41:37 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ok, I guess your opinion is your opinion.

And I didn't miss quote you. It's called an ellipsis.. I didn't want to have my post be made up of your post so I took the first and last line and divided it in the middle with the ellipsis telling people that there are words there they where just omitted. 3 dots means I omitted words from your sentence, while 4 dots means I omitted sentences in a paragraph.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 27 Jun 2008 13:48:09 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Fri, 27 June 2008 09:41Ok, I guess your opinion is your opinion.

And I didn't miss quote you. It's called an ellipsis.. I didn't want to have my post be made up of your post so I took the first and last line and divided it in the middle with the ellipsis telling people that there are words there they where just omitted.

I know what an ellipsis is. I'm talking about where you quoted me as saying "liberties only makes the people less powerful." That is far from reflecting my view, and just plain false.

The problem with people wanting legislation on anything that could be used dangerously ignores two facts. The first being that most people are smart enough to where they're going to avoid

harming others. People aren't THAT selfish and arrogant, especially when they have dire consequences for those actions. The second being that just because something CAN happen doesn't mean that it WILL. As Nukelt said, we get rid of the idea of innocent until proven guilty when we punish others (yes, restricting civil liberties is a punishment. That's the principle our prison system runs on.) for something that they didn't do, and probably never were going to do.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Fri, 27 Jun 2008 19:59:53 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I see it like this... the government has every right to restrict civil liberties ONLY IF the consent of the people it governs is involved.

For example, if I was to propose the licensing of heavy weapons to the government and you were to propose that it was a bad idea to do that, the government could chose to go either way regardless of what the Constitution says because the idea was proposed by an individual that is under the government's 'rule.'

However, if the government one day said that they are putting a restriction on heavy weapons with no prior warning, than THAT is unconstitutional because the people's say was not involved. It would also be unconstitutional if they instated such a law regardless if the majority of the people voted against it.

So in order for it to be proposed and looked at without it being unconstitutional is if it is proposed by the people. And in order for it to fall through and be instated it needs to be approved by the people. The government is just there to mediate the people's wants.

The Constitution is not a rule book, it is merely a guide line. Things said in the Constitution should never be taken with the fullest seriousness because things in the Constitution can be changed by the will of the people. That is why basing an argument on something that is said in the Constitution is quite pointless (as it can be changed with a simple proposal and vote).

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 27 Jun 2008 20:58:43 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0rI see it like this... the government has every right to restrict civil liberties ONLY IF the consent of the people it governs is involved.

For example, if I was to propose the licensing of heavy weapons to the government and you were to propose that it was a bad idea to do that, the government could chose to go either way regardless of what the Constitution says because the idea was proposed by an individual that is under the government's 'rule.'

However, if the government one day said that they are putting a restriction on heavy weapons with

no prior warning, than THAT is unconstitutional because the people's say was not involved. It would also be unconstitutional if they instated such a law regardless if the majority of the people voted against it.

So in order for it to be proposed and looked at without it being unconstitutional is if it is proposed by the people. And in order for it to fall through and be instated it needs to be approved by the people. The government is just there to mediate the people's wants.

The Constitution is not a rule book, it is merely a guide line. Things said in the Constitution should never be taken with the fullest seriousness because things in the Constitution can be changed by the will of the people. That is why basing an argument on something that is said in the Constitution is quite pointless (as it can be changed with a simple proposal and vote).
NO NO NO NO NO NO NO NO NO.

America is a REPUBLIC. We're not a democracy. We don't follow mob rule. Our government wasn't created so things could be done the way the people wanted to at that time.

The Constitution is a document stating what the government CANNOT take away from its citizens. EVER. AT ANY POINT IN TIME. PERIOD. It IS to be taken 100% seriously. Anything less destroys the integrity of the document. You can't just pick and choose what's relevant to the nation at that time. It's that kind of clumsy, irresponsible bullshit that brought us the Patriot Act.

The Bill of Rights were written as Amendments to the Constitution SO THEY COULD NEVER BE CHANGED.

Oh, and I expect Nukelt to write a 10 page essay on why what you just said is wrong on so many different levels. What you said pissed me off too much for me to formulate a long reply. Nukelt seems to have more patience and tolerance than I do.

Subject: Re: Gun control
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Fri, 27 Jun 2008 21:53:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Actually, I'm still trying to process this line:

Quote:The Constitution is not a rule book, it is merely a guide line.

Have you ever had one of those moments when something gives you such a colossal mind-fuck that your entire train of thought derails and then explodes? I just had one. I can't bring myself to respond to anything else; it has become the only thing worth talking about in this thread.

This is the United States of America. The Constitution isn't just a rule book, you ignorant fool, it is the highest law in the land. Amendments may be added or repealed (while we're on that, the Bill of Rights is an exception- it is a necessary part of the document and to be messed with at our peril), but the basic document itself may only be altered or replaced by an overwhelming majority vote. We're talking change on such a massive scale that it has only been affected twice in the entire history of our nation- the Articles of Confederation were brought into effect following the

Revolution, and only a few years later the Constitution was laid down. That's it; never since. The Constitution has not been altered since 1787. Changing that document at this point in time would be exactly the same thing as dissolving the USA and founding a whole new fucking nation. The Constitution is America. One does not exist without the other.

Just for your information, since you seem to be so ill-informed: the validity of every single law in this country is determined based on whether or not it is permitted by the Constitution. Every single one from the lowliest parking ordinance to who is allowed to vote. The Supreme Court was established for the sole purpose of interpreting the Constitution to determine which laws are valid and which are not, and any law may be challenged and struck down if the Court finds it un-Constitutional. Whether a law may be justified by the Constitution isn't just relevant to the issue, it is an absolutely essential detail. It is the issue. The Constitution is and has been the driving force behind emancipation, desegregation, womens' suffrage, age of consent, firearms legislation, and every other significant social or legal issue in this country for the past two and a half centuries... not to mention the Civil War.

And here's the clincher: Law as laid down in the Constitution exists not to regulate and restrict the People, but to restrict the government. In point of fact, the only part of the entire Constitution which acts against the people rather than against the government is Amendment #18- which was repealed as un-Constitutional by Amendment #21. The very first words in the Constitution are "We The People." Not "We the Congress," not "We the Supreme Court Justices," not "We the States," and certainly not "We the Executives." I suggest you find a copy and read it some time; you obviously understand neither its purpose nor its content. Here's a link to get you started- if you've got the courage to change your mind.

The Constitution is the ultimate Law in the United States of America. It is always relevant, it should always be taken seriously, and it is the will of the People.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [w0dka](#) on Fri, 27 Jun 2008 22:10:31 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

.....

Why you need a gun?

For self defence?

mhm you want to take out your gun when someone is holding his gun right into your face? If there is a full gunban then the criminal probaly have a gun and you not. But why this is better? He don't need to kill you. He knows that he won't get a shot in the back the second he's fleeing. Police job is easier. Just arrest everyone with a gun and ask why hes got one. Two days ago they blocked a few street because someone in the city was seen with a gun. K it was a replica but hey, police reacted and cleared situation.

To rescue USA?

Sure thing. If you're big airforce, you're nuclear arsenal, or the biggest army in the world don't stop a intruder a few million with shotguns and pistol armed patriots will do it. You should ban hollywood films.

Kill-Kill-Kill i just hear "I kill this motherfucker" ...
whats happend to the good old Lets-meet-and-talk-about? Ort the
please-dont-kill-me-here-is-all-my-money-insurance-will-pay-me-anyway

Subject: Re: Gun control
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Fri, 27 Jun 2008 22:22:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:
This is the United States of America. You know, this actually is the Internet.

Subject: Re: Gun control
Posted by [w0dka](#) on Fri, 27 Jun 2008 22:48:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nukelt15 wrote on Wed, 25 June 2008 19:47

Any handgun defense course will teach you that there are only two targets worth shooting for-center of mass, or the head. Center of mass because, if you are using a larger caliber weapon (in practice, pretty much anything bigger or punchier than a .380 ACP), there is a very good chance that a CoM shot will put your target on the ground unless they are either Superman or so whacked out on drugs that they keep coming anyway. Head, because as we all know there is absolutely no chance of the criminal firing back if they are dead. The standard FBI/law enforcement training target lacks arms and legs for exactly this reason: a nonlethal shot is an ideal, not a reality.

I'm surprised. in Germany our police is trained for only non lethal shots for arms, legs... And even that only as a last option if the target is a danger to life. And we don't have problems with guns

And you're scenario:

the criminals who want to rob something in USA would he REALLY think he rob someone unarmed? Well if i'm a criminal in the USA i will shot the shopkeeper, take the money and flee. Why? If he is alive he will maybe shot me the same second i lower my gun for fleeing or taking the money. He will call the police and help them find me. Armed robbery is a serios business. And i can't life for eternity from robing 100 bucks. I need to steal more. Next robbery? So why to worry about death toll? If i kill 22 shopkeepers and get caught i will get executed. I kill one and i will get executed. So whats is stoping me from killing everyone i didn't like/in my way after the first one?

Now the same situation in Germany.

I want to rob a bank. Wait I don't have a weapon I can buy one at black market. cool. Maybe police find me. Got a weapon now. go to the bank. All employees and guests raise their hands. Be frightened but don't play hero. they know their money is covered by insurance. See the difference?

cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 25 June 2008 17:36

Even if gun ownership DIDN'T make people safer (which can easily be proven that it HAS), it certainly hasn't created any more violence, and thus has no reason to be banned. I want to see that proof.

cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 25 June 2008 12:44 Then you completely ignore the simplest of arguments: Guns don't kill people. A properly functioning, high-powered rifle cannot kill people.

Face it, just about anything can be used as a murder weapon. I can kill people with my car. I can kill people with knives. I can kill people with scissors. I can kill people with my bare hands. I can kill people with a pen. I can kill people with my car keys. I can kill people with a chair. I can kill people with a toaster. I can kill people with a glass bottle. I can kill people with a golf club. I can kill people with a baseball bat. I can kill people with a plastic bag. I can kill people with a crowbar. I can kill people with a pillow. I think you guys get the point. If not, I'll name some more later.

just asking? How many people you see killing someone with scissors? Sure. Possible. but not real. Also it's quite more difficult to aim for proper organs with a scissor, train yourself to kill someone with bare hands. But just holding an assault rifle in the general direction of a victim and pull the trigger = easy kill.

Oh and I want to see someone robbing a bank with a pillow. Or defending his family from this bad thief ... with a pillow.

You really think that hitting someone with something 2-3 times and he's dead. Wrong the human body is not that easy killable. You get really badly injured. Maybe but you survive. A gunshot without fast medical treatment in the torso kills you.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Fri, 27 Jun 2008 23:52:18 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

sadukar09 wrote on Fri, 27 June 2008 07:08 I find it amusing that Canada has lower gun related deaths than U.S. and has almost as high gun per capita. (In case you want to source, it's here.)

The data I want to point out is this, "Firearm Homicide" the U.S. have 3.72 x100,000 rate, while Canada have 0.72x100,000. This is 14 year old data, but the more accurate 2008 data would probably reflect the same thing.

Edit: Scroll to the bottom, and see a graph of gun related deaths.

<http://www.cdc.gov/MMWR/preview/mmwrhtml/00046149.htm>

I will go back to this post...

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 28 Jun 2008 00:58:26 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

w0dkaPolice job is easier. Just arrest everyone with a gun and ask why hes got one.

Wow, I'm done talking to you. If you can't respect the concept of privacy and to NOT be treated as a criminal when you're NOT impeding on the rights of others, then there's no use trying to debate this. I've tried and failed to get this concept through the heads of people like you. It just isn't worth the time and effort.

Nukelt, so I see your feelings on his Constitution comment are essentially the same as mine. Too aggravating and dumbfounding to even wrap your mind around.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Sat, 28 Jun 2008 15:31:55 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

w0dka, no offense, but get your head out of your ass, please.

America and Germany are two different countries. I know people from Germany, and they have a very different mentality of things. It's a universal thing there usually. You just can't compare European countries' laws, that usually are long-standing ones, with America's laws. You just can't.

Now, as for Nukelt's post- I agree. I'm sick and fucking tired of a few douchebags in congress or somesuch getting it in their head that because some people want something changed, they have the power to do so.

A politician's power in the United States should not be one that is allowed to change the constitution. Rather, it should be a position that simply gives them the ability to decide whether or not a specific law should be passed or not by abiding by the constitution.

Something like "The right to bear arms" should be obvious as to what it means. No, it doesn't mean you can have genetic implants to change your arms to that of a bear's (As badass as that'd be).

It means you should be able to carry weapons. A politicians duty should not be one to decide if that should be removed. It should be one to decide how to make it work in todays society. For example, they should simply question how exactly it should be worked out so gun related deaths can go down, while keeping the rights of its law abiding citizens. Should a criminal be allowed to keep a gun? Should a person with mental illnesses be allowed to keep a gun? Things like that should be questioned. Not "Should we allow guns atall or not?".

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 28 Jun 2008 15:49:39 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Cabal, the issue wasn't whether or not guns were to be allowed, it was WHO got to have them. It was argued that the founding fathers intended only for a "well regulated militia" to have and bear arms, and not the people. Although, it clearly says, "the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Sat, 28 Jun 2008 16:06:05 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yeah, I couldn't quite find the exact words for it, but that's sort of what I meant, for the general public.

Good thing it's allowed now, though.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Sun, 29 Jun 2008 01:47:35 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nukelt15 wrote on Fri, 27 June 2008 17:53

Have you ever had one of those moments when something gives you such a colossal mind-fuck that your entire train of thought derails and then explodes? I just had one. I can't bring myself to respond to anything else; it has become the only thing worth talking about in this thread.

Actually, yes. Just now reading your post. I read the first line and wanted to point out that I said it WASN'T a rule book. I tried to read the rest of your post but I couldn't concentrate on it cause the first line. It seemed you started going off on a tangent anyway.

The Bill of Rights is just that a list of rights not rules. Rules are put in place to give limitations, not grant abilities and rights. Having the right to freedom, press, speech, religion, ect, is not something I would consider a "rule." Having the right to bear arms isn't a rule either.

The Constitution, like I said, is NOT A RULE BOOK. It is a guideline on how to run the country in which rules are BASED from. The Constitution isn't the "highest law of the land" it is the backbone behind the law of the land. For example, a rule can be made as long as the Constitution supports it. If the Constitution doesn't support it, then the rule is not enforced. The same way dollar bills need to back backed up by silver and gold. Without the gold, the paper is worthless.

But anyway, going back to what I said before about it being a guideline... because it is a guideline, we can sway away from it as much as we want except when we cross it and what we do becomes unconstitutional. For example, punishments for crimes can be dealt with anyway seen fit, but if the punishment is seen as undeserving or cruel and unusual, then there is a problem.

However, this is all besides the point. This is why I hate politics so much. It goes from a simple discussion to a debate on why and why not something can or cannot be done. We should be instating and enforcing what is best for the country, not what is best outlined in the Constitution. This is why political parties fail. I mean they original started out healthy, but now everything is divided because of stupid disagreements. Instead of labeling people on what they like and what you don't, we should all be looking at what is best for the country, for the people. I've seen so many people not vote for a president that supported what they thought might be good for the country just because they were of a different party than them. It's pointless, I tell you.

erhm... but I went off on a tangent this time.. forget what I said, this thread's discussion is gone and I've lost interest. You can reply to my post, but don't expect me to reply back to yours (unless you specifically request I do, in which case I might think about it.)

Also btw, to the person who said America wasn't a democracy but a republic. No, it is neither. It is a Democratic-Republic, taking the best interests of both systems and combining it into something unique.

Subject: Re: Gun control
Posted by [Starbuzzz](#) on Sun, 29 Jun 2008 02:09:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

W00t R315r4z0r!

Subject: Re: Gun control
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 29 Jun 2008 06:15:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0rThe Bill of Rights is just that a list of rights not rules. Rules are put in place to give limitations, not grant abilities and rights. Having the right to freedom, press, speech, religion, ect, is not something I would consider a "rule." Having the right to bear arms isn't a rule either.

The Constitution, like I said, is NOT A RULE BOOK. It is a guideline on how to run the country in which rules are BASED from. The Constitution isn't the "highest law of the land" it is the backbone behind the law of the land. For example, a rule can be made as long as the Constitution supports it. If the Constitution doesn't support it, then the rule is not enforced. The same way dollar bills need to back backed up by silver and gold. Without the gold, the paper is worthless.

But anyway, going back to what I said before about it being a guideline... because it is a guideline, we can sway away from it as much as we want except when we cross it and what we do becomes unconstitutional. For example, punishments for crimes can be dealt with anyway seen fit, but if the punishment is seen as undeserving or cruel and unusual, then there is a problem.

However, this is all besides the point. This is why I hate politics so much. It goes from a simple discussion to a debate on why and why not something can or cannot be done. We should be

instating and enforcing what is best for the country, not what is best outlined in the Constitution. This is why political parties fail. I mean they original started out healthy, but now everything is divided because of stupid disagreements. Instead of labeling people on what they like and what you don't, we should all be looking at what is best for the country, for the people. I've seen so many people not vote for a president that supported what they thought might be good for the country just because they were of a different party than them. It's pointless, I tell you.

erhm... but I went off on a tangent this time.. forget what I said, this thread's discussion is gone and I've lost interest. You can reply to my post, but don't expect me to reply back to yours (unless you specifically request I do, in which case I might think about it.)

Also btw, to the person who said America wasn't a democracy but a republic. No, it is neither. It is a Democratic-Republic, taking the best interests of both systems and combining it into something unique.

You do understand that the Constitution and the Amendments were written to limit the powers of government, right? Therefore, it HAS to be a rule book. The Amendments aren't saying, "the right of the people to keep and bear arms should probably not be infringed upon." It says it SHALL NOT be infringed upon. There's no room in that phrasing for there to be any "guideline". That was written as a direct COMMAND towards the government to not take away that right.

THEN in the 10th Amendment, it states that the powers NOT granted to Congress already nor prohibited to the States, are given to the States and the people. Again, there's no, "maybe you should let the States handle it." It was a direct command telling the federal government to back the fuck off.

Guidelines usually imply some leeway in how to deal with things. Our Amendments were written with such strong language that it's meant to be taken 100% seriously and followed to its fullest extent.

Our founding fathers knew fucking damn well what a powerful government would do. That is why the Constitution was written in the first place. These men were incredibly brilliant. They knew what they were dealing with in terms of tyrannical governments. They knew what was best left in the hands of the people. To tell me that we should regard their document, the foundation of our nation, as merely a guideline is an insult to them.

Please understand the founding fathers knew what they were talking about. I don't know if I can ever stress this enough. What they have said about powerful governments and the consequences of that has rang true. These things were said 200 years ago. Human nature doesn't change. The quest for power and the greed of money is universal and timeless. To regard the Constitution as something that merely guides us in the right direction, but ultimately should give way to what the people believe is foolish.

I don't know how this has anything to do with political parties, but I will agree with you completely. People are stuck with stupid alliances, and they won't waiver. It's why I hate the two party system. My mom mentioned she's heard a lot of people saying they won't vote this year. I shake my head at this unpatriotic act. If they truly cared that much, they'd vote for someone they actually agree with.

As far as America now being a Democratic-Republic, yeah, and that's unfortunate. It wasn't meant to be nearly this democratic. I really do wish Senators were back to being appointed by the States.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [ids48](#) on Sun, 29 Jun 2008 10:33:36 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

did they have assault rifles in the 1770's?

and at least back then they didnt have crazy indians that wanted to kill people settling in the middle of nowhere, where no help was you likely seniario.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sun, 29 Jun 2008 10:53:18 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ids48 wrote on Sun, 29 June 2008 05:33did they have assault rifles in the 1770's?

and at least back then they didnt have crazy indians that wanted to kill people settling in the middle of nowhere, where no help was you likely seniario.

Come again?

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sun, 29 Jun 2008 19:47:39 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r, I am bound to agree with you on one thing: this thread's discussion is dead. The longer it goes on, the dumber it gets.

ids48, please go read a history book before you embarrass yourself further. I didn't think anybody could top the sheer mind-numbing ignorance of the whole "Constitution isn't law" bit, but you've somehow managed it.

Thread over; leave it to the rats. It's only gonna get worse from here.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 02 Jul 2008 19:00:42 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:I shake my head at this unpatriotic act. If they truly cared that much, they'd vote for someone they actually agree with.

Heh, the unfortunate thing is you need there to be a party you agree with first.

If you don't agree with any of the options, its hard to want to vote for any one of them.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Wed, 02 Jul 2008 19:06:29 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

unpatriotic act hahaha.
stupid.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 02 Jul 2008 19:32:24 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warranto wrote on Wed, 02 July 2008 15:00Quote:I shake my head at this unpatriotic act. If they truly cared that much, they'd vote for someone they actually agree with.

Heh, the unfortunate thing is you need there to be a party you agree with first.

If you don't agree with any of the options, its hard to want to vote for any one of them.
You can write-in someone's name. Plus, there's so many different candidates from so many different parties. Whether someone gets one vote or 10 million votes, voting for someone you believe in is important. If not, you only feed into the complacency that America is full of.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 02 Jul 2008 20:33:02 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Now that I did not know of... writing in someone's name.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 02 Jul 2008 22:01:37 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I figured you didn't know that. My point is less elitist now, isn't it?

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 02 Jul 2008 22:14:10 GMT

Heh, never thought of it as elitist comment. Just one said out of exasperation because of how apathetic voters can be.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 03 Jul 2008 17:48:04 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0rblah blah blah

I just found this quote...

I consider the foundation of the Constitution as laid on this ground: That "all powers not delegated to the United States, by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States or to the people." To take a single step beyond the boundaries thus specially drawn around the powers of Congress, is to take possession of a boundless field of power, no longer susceptible of any definition. -- Thomas Jefferson

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [Memphis](#) on Thu, 03 Jul 2008 22:32:08 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:HOUSTON (AP) — The cha-chick of a shell entering a shotgun's chamber rattled through the 911 line just before Joe Horn stepped out his front door.

Horn, 61, had phoned police when he saw two men break into his neighbor's suburban Houston home through a window in broad daylight. Now they were getting away with a bag of loot.

"Don't go outside the house," the 911 operator pleaded. "You're going to get yourself shot if you go outside that house with a gun. I don't care what you think."

"You want to make a bet?" Horn answered. "I'm going to kill them."

He did.

Admirers, including several of his neighbors, say Horn is a hero for killing the burglars, protecting his neighborhood and sending a message to would-be criminals. Critics call him a loose cannon. His attorney says Horn just feared for his life.

Prosecuting Horn could prove difficult in Texas, where few people sympathize with criminals and many have an almost religious belief in the right to self-defense. The case could test the state's self-defense laws, which allow people to use deadly force in certain situations to protect themselves, their property and their neighbors' property.

Horn was home in Pasadena, about 15 miles southeast of Houston, on Nov. 14 when he heard glass breaking, said his attorney, Tom Lambright. He looked out the window and saw 38-year-old

Miguel Antonio DeJesus and 30-year-old Diego Ortiz using a crowbar to break out the rest of the glass.

He grabbed a 12-gauge shotgun and called 911, Lambright said.

"Uh, I've got a shotgun," he told the dispatcher. "Uh, do you want me to stop them?"

"Nope, don't do that," the dispatcher responded. "Ain't no property worth shooting somebody over, OK?"

Horn and the dispatcher spoke for several minutes, during which Horn pleaded with the dispatcher to someone to catch the men and vowed not to let them escape. Over and over, the dispatcher told him to stay inside. Horn repeatedly said he couldn't.

When the men crawled back out the window carrying a bag, Horn began to sound increasingly frantic.

"Well, here it goes, buddy," Horn said as a shell clicked into the chamber. "You hear the shotgun clicking, and I'm going."

A few seconds passed.

"Move," Horn can be heard saying on the tape. "You're dead."

Boom.

Click.

Boom.

Click.

Boom.

Horn redialed 911 and told the dispatcher what he'd done.

"I had no choice," he said, his voice shaking. "They came in the front yard with me, man. I had no choice. Get somebody over here quick."

Lambright said Horn had intended to take a look around when he left his house and instead came face to face with the burglars, standing 10 to 12 feet from him in his yard.

Horn is heavysset and middle-aged and would have been no match in a physical confrontation with the two men, who were young and strong, Lambright said. So when one or both of them "made lunging movements," Horn fired in self-defense, he said.

Family members of the two shooting victims have made few public statements.

Diamond Morgan, Ortiz's widow, who has an 8-month-old son with him, told Houston television station KTRK that she was stunned by Horn's statements on the 911 tape. "It's horrible," she said. "He was so eager, so eager to shoot."

The Associated Press could not find a telephone listing for Morgan.

The case brought back memories of Bernard Goetz, the New Yorker whom some hailed as a folk hero after he shot four teenagers he said were trying to rob him when they asked for \$5 on a subway in 1984.

Goetz was cleared of attempted murder and assault charges but convicted of illegal possession of the gun he used to shoot the youths. He served 8 1/2 months in jail and was ordered by a jury to pay \$43 million to one of the teenagers he shot.

Pasadena police were still investigating Monday and planned to present their findings to Harris County prosecutors within the next two weeks, police spokesman Vance Mitchell said. From there, it is expected to be presented to a grand jury. In the meantime, Horn remains uncharged.

Texas law allows people to use deadly force to protect themselves if it is reasonable to believe they could otherwise be killed. In some cases, people also can use deadly force to protect their neighbors' property; for example, if a homeowner asks a neighbor to watch over his property while he's out of town.

At issue is whether it was reasonable for Horn to fear the men and whether his earlier threats on the 911 call showed he planned to kill them no matter what, said Fred C. Moss, who teaches criminal law at Southern Methodist University in Dallas.

A prime example of a situation being made worse because of someone possessing a gun. I think guns encourage vigilante behavior which is what I think happened here.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 03 Jul 2008 22:59:29 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Mr. Horn is fucking awesome. I want a neighbor like him.

Oh, and he was cleared of the charges.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 04 Jul 2008 00:31:34 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Eh, vigilante justice is a... uneasy discussion.

Its the real love-hate relationship, and a gamble. Under the right situations, it can be useful and

right. However it is a very fine line between righteous vigilante justice and misplaced justice.

Did thieves deserve the death penalty? I don't think so. I do not believe Mr. Horn was right or just in his execution of the two thieves. This would be a great example of "vigilante justice" gone wrong.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 04 Jul 2008 05:00:49 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

From Mr. Horn's accounts, he only shot at them once they started coming towards him.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 04 Jul 2008 14:26:50 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

After he went out there looking for a fight.

He purposefully put himself into a dangerous situation, then used that as an excuse to fire.

The court may have excused the action, but it doesn't make it any less of the "bad" kind of vigilante justice.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 04 Jul 2008 17:28:49 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

They still came after him. So if an old lady is getting mugged, you can't step in and shoot the guy if he turns on you, then? How would that not be justified?

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 04 Jul 2008 17:43:25 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Rescuing someone from danger is far different than rescuing items from theft.

However, if you wait until AFTER the mugging and go search for the people and confront them, then no - its just simply you putting yourself into danger when there is no dire need for it.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 04 Jul 2008 20:18:38 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Personally, I see no difference in terms of one's life and one's property. As far as I'm concerned, they're one in the same in law. A crime is a crime, and all rights need to be upheld.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [Rocko](#) on Fri, 04 Jul 2008 20:38:34 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cheesesoda wrote on Fri, 04 July 2008 15:18 Personally, I see no difference in terms of one's life and one's property. As far as I'm concerned, they're one in the same in law. A crime is a crime, and all rights need to be upheld.

i once killed a man for trying to steal my ipod.

the second amendment was put in place so that my people could wipe each other out

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 04 Jul 2008 20:40:04 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Rocko wrote on Fri, 04 July 2008 16:38 cheesesoda wrote on Fri, 04 July 2008 15:18 Personally, I see no difference in terms of one's life and one's property. As far as I'm concerned, they're one in the same in law. A crime is a crime, and all rights need to be upheld.

i once killed a man for trying to steal my ipod

If this were true, I wouldn't see you as a criminal.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 04 Jul 2008 20:54:16 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cheesesoda wrote on Fri, 04 July 2008 14:18 Personally, I see no difference in terms of one's life and one's property. As far as I'm concerned, they're one in the same in law. A crime is a crime, and all rights need to be upheld.

So kill everyone who commits a crime?

edit: I highly doubt someone would agree to the RIAA sending hitmen after everyone who downloads a copyrighted song...

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 04 Jul 2008 21:39:35 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Internet = Neutral. TYVM.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 05 Jul 2008 03:01:53 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ah, I see...

So child pornography is ok with you.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 05 Jul 2008 03:11:03 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Is it okay with me? Of course, it isn't, but you should know by now that my personal convictions don't have any bearing on my political views.

On the Internet, it's hard to want to say "yes" to allowing child porn, but the Internet is a neutral ground. It's like international waters. It's unfortunate that these things occur, but it's the price we pay for liberty.

I quoted this in the 'most hated' thread, but this certainly applies here now, "I would rather be exposed to the inconveniences attending too much liberty, than those attending too small a degree of it." Thomas Jefferson, of course.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 05 Jul 2008 04:39:31 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Heh, that's unfortunate.

Though people would love you in power. Identity theft, Copyrights/trademarks/patents theft, defamation etc. are all fair game for you so long at it takes place on the internet.

No such thing as crime, as long as it is on the internet... I love it!

Subject: Re: Gun control
Posted by [Rocko](#) on Thu, 10 Jul 2008 03:16:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

your typical gun owner

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-yl1DnoKRgQ&feature=related>

Subject: Re: Gun control
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 10 Jul 2008 12:16:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Wow, AliG found a redneck in Arkansas. HE'S GOOD.

Subject: Re: Gun control
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Thu, 10 Jul 2008 18:34:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yep, that's EXACTLY what EVERY gun control owner looks like, huh?

Just like how, y'know, every black person likes chicken and watermelon and never contributes to society.

I mean, I might aswell jump on the bandwagon of stupidity and generalization while we're at it, eh?

Subject: Re: Gun control
Posted by [Rocko](#) on Thu, 10 Jul 2008 20:50:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

show me someone who proudly brandishes their gun around who isn't a redneck and/or retard.

Subject: Re: Gun control
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 10 Jul 2008 21:36:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Show me a black teenager that doesn't have saggy pants and likes the bullshit one calls "hip hop" and "rap".

Subject: Re: Gun control
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Thu, 10 Jul 2008 22:02:42 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cheesesoda wrote on Thu, 10 July 2008 16:36 Show me a black teenager that doesn't have saggy pants and likes the bullshit one calls "hip hop" and "rap".

My friend James. Gets A's at school

Rocko wrote on Thu, 10 July 2008 15:50 show me someone who proudly brandishes their gun around who isn't a redneck and/or retard.

Generalizing is bad man

Subject: Re: Gun control
Posted by [Ryu](#) on Fri, 11 Jul 2008 18:15:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cheesesoda wrote on Thu, 10 July 2008 22:36 Show me a black teenager that doesn't have saggy pants and likes the bullshit one calls "hip hop" and "rap".

Show me a American who isn't Christian and not patriotic.

Subject: Re: Gun control
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 11 Jul 2008 18:26:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm not Christian, and what do you mean by "patriotic"? If you're talking about nationalism, then I'm not nationalist.

Subject: Re: Gun control
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Fri, 11 Jul 2008 18:39:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cheesesoda wrote on Fri, 11 July 2008 14:26 I'm not Christian, and what do you mean by "patriotic"? If you're talking about nationalism, then I'm not nationalist.

I do think u care too much about flags and countries...otherwise you would not be nitpicking on honour.

Nationality and patriotism (lols) is based on where your parents did the deed...lols...sure does not mean you should be h8ing your country but you should not forget how you got there (parents deed lols).

On the Christian side though,...can't imagine life as I know it without God...He keeps ME going.

I edited post.

NOTE: poor arse grammer due to eating pizza.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Fri, 11 Jul 2008 18:51:48 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:

On the Christian side though,...can't imagine life as I know it without God...He keeps ME going.
Religion is "parents deed" too O.o

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Fri, 11 Jul 2008 19:55:02 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Surth wrote on Fri, 11 July 2008 13:51Quote:

On the Christian side though,...can't imagine life as I know it without God...He keeps ME going.
Religion is "parents deed" too O.o

Nope...even if no one told me about it, eventually I will figure out what gods to worship. It may not be the same God I worhsip nowm but some god. Sure, WHAT religion I am in now is based on parental influence. Not that hard to figure out...that is why ancinet people worhsip the sun and other natural things...they figured something must be there greater than them.

Of ALL of recoreded history, every human tribe under the sun worhsipped something...so your statement of "religion is parents deed" goes flying out the window lololsolol...! unless ofcourse, if it means specific religion.

It maybe chemicals in our brain that make us worship something but still the perfect symmetrical, SELF-SUFFICIENT design of our bodies is surely not the aftermath results of some big bang bang lmfa....

As for me, I am perfecttly ALLRIGHT with worhsiping God just as a Muslim is perfectly ALLRIGHT with worshipping Allah.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [Rocko](#) on Fri, 11 Jul 2008 20:05:10 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

pawkyfox wrote on Fri, 11 July 2008 14:55Surth wrote on Fri, 11 July 2008 13:51Quote:

On the Christian side though,...can't imagine life as I know it without God...He keeps ME going.
Religion is "parents deed" too O.o

Of ALL of recoreded history, every human tribe under the sun worhsipped something...so your

statement of "religion is parents deed" goes flying out the window lololsololol...! unless ofcourse, if it means specific religion.

yeah ok lol. Ignorant tribesmen and wild savages are the kind of people you would want to associate with as the type of people who find religion. I'd bet a million dollars that now because of true education and science that more people than before are atheist or agnostic.

Subject: Re: Gun control
Posted by [GoArmy44](#) on Fri, 11 Jul 2008 21:56:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

What is this topic about again? lol

Subject: Re: Gun control
Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Sat, 12 Jul 2008 01:44:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cheesesoda wrote on Thu, 10 July 2008 16:36 Show me a black teenager that doesn't have saggy pants and likes the bullshit one calls "hip hop" and "rap".

Brandon and Alex Klienshcimdt. They were good friends of mine and their parents wouldn't allow the ghetto stuff in their house just like their mom. She was blacker than most black people I see today and yet she spoke perfect english not the Yea Yea wut up bullshit because her parents wouldn't let that ghetto talk come in the house.

Subject: Re: Gun control
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 04 Sep 2008 19:42:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yeah, I'm opening up this can again...

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xXHsCYDUF44>

I know what will be said. "Banning all guns will take the gun out of that intruder's hands." Yeah, okay. Good luck with that. Getting warrants for every household in order to storm them and search and seize every firearm might be a little difficult. Unless, of course, you want to completely shit on the Constitution and ignore the Bill of Rights.

Subject: Re: Gun control
Posted by [u6795](#) on Thu, 04 Sep 2008 20:21:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think everybody should carry around swords instead of guns.

Think of how fucking awesome our society would be today. Drive by stabbings.. hell yeah.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [mr£Ä\\$Ä·z](#) on Thu, 04 Sep 2008 20:26:52 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I HAS BAZOOOOKA

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [Rocko](#) on Fri, 05 Sep 2008 00:18:03 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cheesesoda wrote on Thu, 04 September 2008 14:42Yeah, I'm opening up this can again...

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xXHsCYDUF44>

I know what will be said. "Banning all guns will take the gun out of that intruder's hands." Yeah, okay. Good luck with that. Getting warrants for every household in order to storm them and search and seize every firearm might be a little difficult. Unless, of course, you want to completely shit on the Constitution and ignore the Bill of Rights.
that youtube is fake

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 05 Sep 2008 00:25:24 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm not entirely sure it is, but if it is, are you going to tell me that there's not, at all, a chance of that scenario actually playing out?

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [Rocko](#) on Fri, 05 Sep 2008 00:34:51 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ok yes but guns are still legal right now anyways. Why didnt she go out and buy a gun anyways if they were so essential to safety lol

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 05 Sep 2008 00:44:03 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Because people are idiots and/or poor. I'd have a CCW and a gun right now if I had any money to spend.

Subject: Re: Gun control
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Fri, 05 Sep 2008 01:11:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cheesesoda wrote on Thu, 04 September 2008 19:44Because people are idiots and/or poor. I'd have a CCW and a gun right now if I had any money to spend.

Also most people are humbled by the power of the gun so they won't feel good buying it.

AND OH lol thanks for the bump reminds me:

3 weeks ago at around 10:00 PM my neighbor noticed 3-4 guys walking up to the window of another house nearby. We live in a row of big townhomes.

Actually his wife noticed the intruders...these guys were looking into the windows and doors of my other neighbor. While calling police, my neighbor got his gun and went to the guys and spoke with them trying to get them to stay longer. But they somehow noticed the gun he had on him..and bolted away.

man...3 mins later there were, believe it or not, 12 police cars lol! 12!

I don't know if I would want to have a gun in my home but atleast I feel very safe knowing my friendly neighbors all got guns roflmao

Subject: Re: Gun control
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 05 Sep 2008 01:31:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Again, people are idiots.

Nobody in their right mind wants to shoot someone. The gun wouldn't even have to be shot often. I'd rather not like that there's a gun in the house rather than not like that an intruder has an upperhand.

Subject: Re: Gun control
Posted by [u6795](#) on Fri, 05 Sep 2008 01:57:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Seriously, guys. Swords.

Picture this. You walk into school and then this guy prepares to go all Cho Seung Heui on everybody, and whips out a katana or something.

LITTLE DID HE KNOW.. The principal happens to be carrying his motherfucking claymore.

Much epic ensues.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Fri, 05 Sep 2008 02:16:52 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I just bought #7 today. It's not a big gun- a lightweight 8-shot S&W .22 revolver. I paid for it out of my own pocket; I wouldn't have had it any other way- only the two which were my 18th and 21st birthday presents were paid for with anyone's money other than mine. I've spent several thousand dollars on firearms and ammunition since my 18th birthday, and I have yet to regret a single purchase. Each weapon fulfills a specific role, and I've practiced with every one of them- some since before I owned them, as my Dad owns many of the same guns I do (including the one I just bought).

My take on that call- I don't know if it was faked or not, but it was at least altered at the end; a gunshot is much, much louder than that. Even a .22 in a different part of the house is louder than that, unless there's a silencer attached- and the weapon in the clip didn't have one. The voices, on the other hand, were unaltered; if the 911 system were equipped with automatic volume control software, some of the screams would have been toned down as well. If you can alter it, you can fake it- QED. Lacking further evidence, it is impossible to tell whether or not the call really took place; a link to a news site might help clear things up.

Regardless, that call is a perfect example of why neither side will ever see the other eye-to-eye- we just don't think the same way. When a gun control advocate hears a clip like that, they think: "if we had better gun control, that lady and her baby might still be alive." When a gun rights advocate hears the same clip, they think: "if that lady had a gun, she and her baby would still be alive." Only one of the above can be correct- and I've made abundantly clear in the past which argument I support.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [Rocko](#) on Fri, 05 Sep 2008 05:10:46 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

both are correct

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 05 Sep 2008 12:07:09 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Actually "better gun control" never does anything good. Beyond keeping the crazies from getting guns, gun control is utterly useless, unless we want to disarm the citizens (which governments like to do).

If guns never existed, things might be better, but that's not the case.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [u6795](#) on Fri, 05 Sep 2008 18:42:27 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cheesesoda wrote on Fri, 05 September 2008 08:07: Actually "better gun control" never does anything good. Beyond keeping the crazies from getting guns, gun control is utterly useless, unless we want to disarm the citizens (which governments like to do).

If guns never existed, things might be better, but that's not the case.
This, because then people would use SWORDS!!1

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [Rocko](#) on Sat, 06 Sep 2008 04:45:13 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I am open to allowing guns but there has to be a lot of gun control, to keep ex-cons and psychos from being able to purchase weapons.

Another note, I always hate those annoying NRA gun nuts who want to allow everything and anything, including shit like hollow armor piercing cop killing bullets etc.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Sat, 06 Sep 2008 05:12:11 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yeah, the only gun control that should be done is on ex-cons, criminals, etc.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 06 Sep 2008 12:48:52 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The biggest problem with that is if they're willing to break the law, and they have the intent to actually harm someone, gun control won't do shit.

I'd support the government purchasing guns for every American citizen above the age of 18, except those in the prison system. That way you know everybody's armed. Those that don't want to carry the guns, they don't have to. If they want to refuse the gun, they can. Everybody who refuses a gun or already has one has the chance of getting a tax credit. This way, criminals have to fear who may have kept their gun or who may not have.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sat, 06 Sep 2008 15:47:13 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:including shit like hollow armor piercing cop killing bullets etc.

Rocko, do you ever bother to do your research before posting?

Ignorance and misinformation are not valid arguments, in case you were wondering.

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [Rocko](#) on Sat, 06 Sep 2008 21:09:50 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nukelt15 wrote on Sat, 06 September 2008 10:47Quote:including shit like hollow armor piercing cop killing bullets etc.

Rocko, do you ever bother to do your research before posting?

Ignorance and misinformation are not valid arguments, in case you were wondering.
k forgive me for not adding commas, are you going to go out and have sex with your gun later today

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [Cabal X39](#) on Sat, 06 Sep 2008 22:25:24 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Rocko wrote on Sat, 06 September 2008 16:09Nukelt15 wrote on Sat, 06 September 2008 10:47Quote:including shit like hollow armor piercing cop killing bullets etc.

Rocko, do you ever bother to do your research before posting?

Ignorance and misinformation are not valid arguments, in case you were wondering.
k forgive me for not adding commas, are you going to go out and have sex with your gun later today

Rocko, you get candies for doing this or what?
Please start to be nice. I know you can do that...

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Sun, 07 Sep 2008 00:06:36 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yeah, generally, that's why commas are a nice addition to a sentence.
